5

6

7

8

9

10

11

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ULYSSES DAVIS, JR.,

No. C 03-04334 RMW (PR)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL;

\*E-FILED - 4/28/08\*

v.

GRANTING EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

DIRECTOR OF HEALTH SERVICES FRIMA STEWART, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff,

(Docket Nos. 48 & 78)

12 13

14

15

16

Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Docket No. 48) is DENIED without prejudice for lack of exceptional circumstances. <u>See Rand v. Rowland</u>, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997).

17

18

On April 2, 2008, plaintiff filed a letter stating that he is unable to respond to

Defendant's motion for summary judgment because he is in the hospital without access to his

19

legal material. Plaintiff requests that the court "put this case off until [he] get[s] out in 22

months." The Court construes plaintiff's request as a motion for extension of time, and

2021

grants plaintiff an initial sixty (60) days extension of time to file an opposition to defendants'

22

grants plaintiff an initial sixty (60) days extension of time to file an opposition to defendants

23

motion for summary judgment. The opposition must be filed **no later than June 9, 2008**.

24

All other provisions of the Court's order of service, filed April 20, 2007, shall remain in effect.

24 25

IT IS SO ORDERED.

26

Dated:

4/21/08

RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

28

27

Order Denying Motion for Appointment of Counsel; Granting Extension of Time to File Opposition P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\CR.03\Davis4334.eot-oppo.HHH.wpd